

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-39 are currently pending in the subject application and are presently under consideration. Applicant's representative notes with appreciation the withdrawal of the claim objections and the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§ 101 and 112.

Favorable reconsideration of the subject patent application is respectfully requested in view of the comments herein.

**I. Drawing Objection Under 37 CFR §1.84(p)(4)**

The drawings had again been objected to for a discrepancy with respect to reference sign 910. Corrected drawings are appended herewith that overcome this objection. Therefore, this objection should be withdrawn.

**II. Rejection of Claims 1-4, 8-14, 16, 17, 20-22, 24, 26-28 Under 35 U.S.C. §102(a)**

Claims 1-4, 8-14, 16, 17, 20-22, 24, 26-28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) as being anticipated by Schaeck *et al.* (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0163513). Withdrawal of this rejection is requested for at least the following reasons. Schaeck *et al.* does not disclose each and every limitation set forth in the subject claims.

A single prior art reference anticipates a patent claim only if it *expressly or inherently describes each and every limitation set forth in the patent claim*. *Trintec Industries, Inc. v. Top-U.S.A. Corp.*, 295 F.3d 1292, 63 USPQ2d 1597 (Fed. Cir. 2002); *See Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). The *identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim*. *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989) (emphasis added).

Applicant's claimed subject matter, as recited in claim 1 (and similarly independent claims 12, 21 26, 33 and 34) relates to a system and method that employs

one or more **shared access profiles** to interact with at least one networked device. The shared access profiles are *customized to delineate at least one of **access and administrative** privileges to the at least one **networked device***. A user interface employs the shared access profile to *provide **users having similar roles** with selective access to the at least one networked device*. In other words, a single shared access profile is used by multiple users, where the users' roles can be, *e.g.* an electrician or technician or others that require similar network access and privileges. It is maintained that Schaeck *et al.* does not disclose or suggest these novel features.

Schaeck *et al.* relates to a system and method of providing a business web portal that supports aggregate web services. The Final Action repeats the previous rejection, further arguing that "shared access profiles" are disclosed in paragraphs [0022] and [0067] of this reference. The Final Action states that:

Paragraph [0067] teaches that different roles for a user can exist in one profile in that the user can login as either employee or admin.

In this way, it is contended that Schaeck *et al.* employs multiple roles for a single user, which is in contradistinction to the claimed invention. A further contention follows that a user role is selected from a different user profile record, which is not a different user profile, citing paragraph [0022], which states:

Preferably, the user role is stored in a user profile associated with the user, and the user role is determined using the user's identification and credentials.

However, this is again irrelevant to the subject claims which relate to a single profile used by multiple users, as presented above. The Final Action further contends that paragraphs [0022] and particularly [0067] of Schaeck *et al.* disclose the claimed *shared access profile* that includes *customized access and/or administrative privileges to a networked device*. However, paragraph [0067] clearly states that roles are specified that correspond to "the user's current log-on status" which "is stored as an attribute of the user's profile." This paragraph further states that, "when a systems administrator logs on with his/her administrative identifier and password, these values will preferably identify a

user profile where the user's role is 'admin' (or some semantic equivalent). If this same person logs on with another identifier, such as a regular employee identifier, then that identifier and password preferably identify a different user profile record having a different user role.” It is therefore abundantly clear from this paragraph that a single user must logon and logoff using a different ID and password in order access the different user profile records having different roles. In no way can these paragraphs or any other portions of Schaeck *et al.* be construed as *providing users having similar roles with selective access to the networked device*, as presently claimed. The Final Action contends that this is disclosed in paragraph [0043], however this slim citation merely uses the term “users” in the plural, and does not disclose or suggest that these users are operating with a *shared access profile* as claimed. In view of at least the foregoing arguments, it is clear that there is nothing in Schaeck *et al.* that discloses or suggests a system or method in accordance with the claimed invention. Therefore, it is readily apparent that the cited document does not disclose or suggest every aspect of the claimed subject matter. Accordingly, the rejection of independent claims 1, 12, 21, 26, 33 and 34 (and claims that depend there from) should be withdrawn.

### **III. Rejection of Claims 5, 7, 19, 23, 29, and 39 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)**

Claims 5, 7, 19, 23, 29, and 39 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Schaeck *et al.* in view of Hayes Jr. *et al.* (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2001/0011341). Withdrawal of this rejection is requested for at least the following reasons. Claims 5 and 7 depend from independent claim 1, claim 19 depends from independent claim 12, claims 23 and 29 depend from independent claim 21, and claim 39 depends from independent claim 34; and as stated *supra*, Schaeck *et al.* does not disclose or suggest every limitation set forth in the subject independent claim, and Hayes Jr. *et al.* does not cure the aforementioned deficiencies. Accordingly, this rejection should be withdrawn.

### **IV. Rejection of Claim 6 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)**

Claim 6 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Schaeck *et al.* Hayes Jr. *et al.*, further in view of Nielsen (US 5,813,007). Withdrawal of

this rejection is requested for at least the following reasons. Claim 6 depends from dependent claim 5, which in turn depends from independent claim 1. As stated *supra*, Schaeck *et al.* does not disclose or suggest every limitation set forth in the subject independent claim. Hayes Jr. *et al.* and Nielsen do not cure the aforementioned deficiencies. For at least these reasons, this rejection should be withdrawn.

**V. Rejection of Claim 15 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)**

Claim 15 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Schaeck *et al.* in view of Hayes Jr. *et al.*, further in view of Gilmour *et al.* (US 6,115,709). Withdrawal of this rejection is requested for at least the following reasons. Claim 15 depends from dependent claim 14, which in turn depends from independent claim 12. Schaeck *et al.* does not disclose or suggest every limitation set forth in the subject independent claim, as stated *supra*. Hayes Jr. *et al.* and Gilmour *et al.* do not cure the aforementioned deficiencies. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

**VI. Rejection of Claims 18 and 25 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)**

Claims 18 and 25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Schaeck *et al.* in view of Hayes Jr. *et al.*, further in view of Sheppard (US 6,026,397). Withdrawal of this rejection is requested for at least the following reasons. Claim 18 depends from dependent claim 16, which in turn depends from independent claim 12, and claim 25 depends from independent claim 21; and as stated *supra*, Schaeck *et al.* does not disclose or suggest every limitation set forth in the subject independent claim, and Hayes Jr. *et al.* and Sheppard do not cure the aforementioned deficiencies. Accordingly, this rejection should be withdrawn.

**CONCLUSION**

The present application is believed to be in condition for allowance in view of the above comments. A prompt action to such end is earnestly solicited.

In the event any fees are due in connection with this document, the Commissioner is authorized to charge those fees to Deposit Account No. 50-1063 [ALBRP318US].

Should the Examiner believe a telephone interview would be helpful to expedite favorable prosecution, the Examiner is invited to contact applicants' undersigned representative at the telephone number below.

Respectfully submitted,

AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP

/Himanshu S. Amin/

Himanshu S. Amin

Reg. No. 40,894

AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP  
24<sup>TH</sup> Floor, National City Center  
1900 E. 9<sup>TH</sup> Street  
Cleveland, Ohio 44114  
Telephone (216) 696-8730  
Facsimile (216) 696-8731